

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

William Earl Tucker,	)	C/A No. 4:07-3991-CMC-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
	)	
Larry W. Powers, Director of Spartanburg County Jail;	)	
Lt. William Church; and	)	
Officer Kunnak,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

The Plaintiff, William Earl Tucker (“Plaintiff”), filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983<sup>1</sup> on December 13, 2007. Plaintiff alleges that his constitutional rights were violated by Defendants. Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on October 1, 2008. Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court issued an order on or about October 2, 2008, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1975), advising that a failure to respond to the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment with additional evidence or counter affidavits could result in the dismissal of his complaint. Plaintiff has failed to file a response.

**A. RULE 41(B) DISMISSAL**

A complaint may be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41 (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to prosecute and/or failure to comply with orders of the court. Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989), cert. denied 493 U.S. 1084 (1990) and Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez, 669 F.2d 919 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir.

---

<sup>1</sup>All pretrial proceedings in this case were referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), DSC. Because this is a dispositive motion, the report and recommendation is entered for review by the District Judge.

1982). In considering whether to dismiss an action pursuant to Rule 41(b), the court is required to consider four factors:

- (1) the degree of plaintiff's responsibility in failing to respond;
- (2) the amount of prejudice to the defendant;
- (3) the history of the plaintiff in proceeding in a dilatory manner; and,
- (4) the existence of less drastic sanctions other than dismissal.

Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69 (4th Cir. 1978).

In the present case, the Plaintiff is proceeding pro se so he is entirely responsible for his actions. It is solely through Plaintiff's neglect, and not that of an attorney, that no responses have been filed. Plaintiff has not responded to Defendants' motion for summary judgment, or the court's Order requiring him to respond. The undersigned concludes the Plaintiff has abandoned his lawsuit as to these Defendants. No other reasonable sanctions are available. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b).

---

## **II. CONCLUSION**

As set out above, a review of the record indicates that the Plaintiff's complaint should be dismissed for failure to prosecute. It is, therefore,

RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b) with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

February 9, 2009  
Florence, South Carolina

**The parties' attention is directed to the important information on the attached notice.**